



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Ballard

Serial No. 09/454,492

Filed: December 6, 1999

Group Art Unit: 2164

Examiner: Weisberger

For: Remote Image Capture with Centralized Processing and Storage

## RECEIVED JAN 0 9 2004 **GROUP 3600**

## RESPONSE TO REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed June 18, 2003, Applicant respectfully presents his response to the Requirement for Information in that Office Action.

The Examiner required information regarding patent infringement suits against parties named RDM, EDS, and Viewpointe Archive Services. Specifically, the Examiner required identification of the alleged infringing devices, and all depositions, interrogatories, and pleadings that discuss the alleged infringing devices.

Applicant encloses the following documents in response to this request:

1. Complaint in DataTreasury Corp. v. Electronic Data Systems Corp., Cause No. 3-02CV2643-M, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in which the EDS NetDeposit® Digital Check Processing system is identified as an accused infringing device.

- 2. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. RDM Corp. a.k.a. Research Development and Manufacturing Corp.*, Cause No. 3-02CV2641-M, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in which the electronic check conversion and payment archive systems of RDM Corp. are identified as accused infringing devices.
- Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Viewpointe Archive Services, L.L.C.*, Cause No. 3-02CV2642-N, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in which the check image archive technology of Viewpointe Archive Services, L.L.C. are identified as accused infringing devices.

On information and belief, the accused infringing devices and products of EDS include the EDS NetDeposit® Digital Check Processing system noted in the Complaint, the accused infringing devices and products of RDM Corp. included their Payment Archive service and their check imagers and scanners, and the accused infringing products of Viewpointe Archive Services include the imaging archive systems and services provided by Viewpointe Archive Services.

On information and belief, the litigation against RDM Corp. has settled, with RDM agreeing to a license under the asserted patents on June 3, 2003.

Further in the spirit of full compliance with the Request for Information, Applicant wishes to advise the Patent and Trademark Office of additional litigation involving U.S. Patent No. 6,032,137 and U.S. Patent No. 5,910,988, through which this application claims priority. To this end, Applicant enclosed copies of the following complaints:

1. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Bank One Corp.*, Cause No. 3-03CV0059-K, In the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas

Division, in which the check processing and check imaging systems of Bank One are identified as accused infringing devices.

- Complaint in DataTreasury Corp. v. First Data Corporation, et al., Cause No. 502CV094, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 3. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Ingenico S.A., et al.,* Cause No. 502CV095, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 4. Complaint in *DataTreasury Corp. v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., et al.,* Cause No. 502CV124, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.

In addition, according to the local rules of the Texarkana Division of the Eastern District of Texas, plaintiff DataTreasury Corp. has submitted Preliminary Infringement Contentions to the Court in each of the First Data, J.P. Morgan Chase, and Ingenico lawsuits. These Preliminary Infringement Contentions specify particular claims of the patents in suit, and the specific "accused instrumentalities" that are alleged to infringe those claims. In this regard, Applicant encloses copies of the following documents:

- 1. Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. First Data Corporation, et al.*, Cause No. 502CV094, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 2. Plantiff's First Amended Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. First Data Corporation, et al.*, Cause No. 502CV094, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.

- 3. Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. Ingenico S.A., et al.*, Cause No. 502CV095, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.
- 4. Plaintiff's Initial Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions in *DataTreasury Corp. v. J.P. Morgan Chase & Co., et al.*, Cause No. 502CV124, In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Texarkana Division.

The undersigned understands that the restriction "Confidential - for Outside Counsel Only" designation on these documents is no longer operative.

On information and belief, one of the parties in the *J.P. Morgan Chase & Co.* litigation, namely Affiliated Computer Services, Inc., has agreed to a permanent injunction from practicing the asserted patents.

Further in the spirit of the duty of disclosure, Applicant will soon be filing, under separate cover, a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement citing many prior art references that various ones of the parties defendants in these lawsuits have submitted in support of invalidity defenses. This Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement will also provide documents filed by these defendants specifying those assertions that the patents in suit are invalid.<sup>1</sup>

Applicant submits that this response is a good faith effort toward fulfilling the Requirement for Information. The Patent and Trademark Office is urged to call the undersigned if there are any questions about this submission.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> MPEP §2001.06(c).

Continued consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney M. Anderson

Registry No. 31,939

Attorney for Applicant

Anderson, Levine & Lintel, L.L.P. 14785 Preston Road, Suite 650 Dallas, Texas 75254 (972) 664-9554

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

37 C.F.R. 1.8

The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an enveloped addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Rodney M. Anderson Registry No. 31,939

on December 17, 2003.

5

PTO/SB/17 (10-03)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PEE	TR	AN	SMI	TT	AL
•	for	FY	200	4	

Effective 10/01/2003. Patent fees are subject to annual revision.

X Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT

SUBMITTED BY

Name (Print/Type)

Signature

Rodney\_M

(\$)	740
------	-----

Complete if Known					
Application Number	09/454,492				
Filing Date	December 6,	1999	7,		
First Named Inventor	Ballard	1999 RECE	IVEL		
Examiner Name	Weisberger	JAN 0 S	2004		
N 4 1 1 14		<del> </del>	MZUU4		

(Complete (if applicable))

Date

Telephone 972-664-9554

Dec. 2003

TOTAL AI	MOUNT OF P	AYMENT	(\$) 740		Attorr	ney Do	cket N	No.   Data.PO1CIPDIV (CD)	
METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)			FEE CALCULATION (continued)						
X Check Credit card Money Other None		3. ADDITIONAL FEES Large Entity , Small Entity							
X Deposit	Account:			Fee	Fee	Fee	Fee		
Deposit Account		01-1615		Code	(\$)	Code	(\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
Number Deposit		01-1015		1051	130	2051		Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
Account Name	Anderso	n,Levine&I	Lintel	1052	50	2052		Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet	
,	s authorized to	o: (check all that ap	pply)	1053	130	1053		Non-English specification	
Charge fee	(s) indicated be	elow X Cred	it any overpayments		2,520	1812		For filing a request for ex parte reexamination	
X Charge any	y additional fee(	(s) or any underpay	ment of fee(s)	1804	920*	1804	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee to the above-identified deposit account.			1805	1,840*	1805	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action		
	FEE C	ALCULATION		1251	110	2251	55	Extension for reply within first month	
1. BASIC F				1252	420	2252	210	Extension for reply within second month	
Large Entity	Small Entity			1253	950	2253	475	Extension for reply within third month	
Fee Fee Code (\$)	Fee Fee Code (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid	1254	1,480	2254	740	Extension for reply within fourth month	740
1001 770	2001 385	Utility filing fee	[ <del></del> ]	1255	2,010	2255	1,005	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1002 340	2002 170	Design filing fee		1401	330	2401	165	Notice of Appeal	
1003 530	2003 265	Plant filing fee		1402	330	2402	165	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1004 770	2004 385	Reissue filing fee	,	1403	290	2403	145	Request for oral hearing	
1005 160	2005 80	Provisional filing	fee	1451	1,510	1451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
SUBTOTAL (1) (\$)		1452	110	2452	55	Petition to revive - unavoidable			
2 EVIDA			Y AND REISSUE	1453	1,330	2453	665	Petition to revive - unintentional	
Z. EXIKA	SLAIM FEE		Fee from	1501	1,330	2501	665	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
Total Claims		Extra Claims	below Fee Paid	1502	480	2502	240	Design issue fee	
Independent	-20'		—	1503	640	2503	320	Plant issue fee	
Claims Multiple Depe	3*	"=		1460	130	1460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
Widniple Dependent 1		1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)			
Large Entity Fee Fee	Small Entity Fee Fee	<u>Fee Descript</u>	ion	1806	180	1806		Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
Code (\$)	Code (\$)	•		8021	40	8021	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
1202 18 1201 86	2202 9 2201 43		s of 20 ims in excess of 3	1809	770	2809	385	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
1203 290	2203 145	•	ent claim, if not paid	1810	770	2810	385	For each additional invention to be	
1204 86	2204 43	** Reissue inde over original p		1801	770	2801	385	examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))  Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
1205 18	2205 9	• .	ns in excess of 20	1802	900	1802	900	` ' '	
			Other fee (specify)						
SUBTOTAL (2) (\$\(\frac{\pmathbf{\q}\ento}\end{\pmathbf{\pmathbf{\pmathbf{\qmathbf{\qmanh}\q\e			*Redu	iced by	Basic F	Filing Fe	ee Paid SUBTOTAL (3) (\$)	740	

WARNING: Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.17 and 1.27. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Registration No.

31,939